

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/384,326	08/26/1999	SEISHIRO YOSHIOKA	35.C5745-CIP	7618	
5514	7590 06/29/2004		EXAMINER		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			SANTIAGO, MARICELI		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2879	<u> </u>	
			DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				Λ	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/384,326	YOSHIOKA ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	×	Mariceli Santiago	2879		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we preceived by the office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Oc	ctober 2003.			
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.				
3)⊠	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-42,56-67,69 and 73-106 is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) 1-42 is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 56-67,69 and 73-106 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is old	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priorical application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicative documents have been received in Received in Received in Received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No. <u>07/218,203</u> . ed in this National Stage		
2) Notice 3) Information	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Particle (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) tr No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal 6)  Other:			

Application/Control Number: 09/384,326

Art Unit: 2879

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Examiner's Comments

Applicant filing of an appropriate supplemental oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 251 stated in the Office Action, mailed July 29, 2003.

## Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following reasons:

The Certificate of Correction changes listed below were not properly completed.

- a) Column 5, line 3
- b) Column 9, line 49
- c) Column 13, line 56

Certificate of Correction changes must be entered in the reissue application without bracketing or underling. MPEP 1411.01. This will incorporate the changes as part of the original patent and not as changes in the reissue.

## Reissue Applications

Claims 56-67, 68 and 73-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Pannu v. Storz Instruments Inc.*, 258 F.3d 1366, 59 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Hester Industries, Inc.* v. *Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement,* 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp.* v. *United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

In the amendments filed February 3, 1993 and January 9, 1995 for Application SN 08/657,385, now U.S. Patent No. 5,661,362, applicant argues that the limitation "a display device having fluorescent members at the inner side of a face plate which is located above the electron-emitting devices" distinguishes the claims from the prior art. Such limitation is omitted from the new claims added in the instant reissue application.

Moreover, if the omitted limitation is replaced by another limitation that is not related to the subject matter previously surrendered by applicant, recapture exist, even though the replacement limitation is a material (narrowing) limitation, and even where the replacement limitation defines the claims over the prior art. Note that in <u>Hester v. Stein, Inc.</u>, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998), the court held that the recapture rule can be triggered by argument alone.

Thus, claims 56-67, 68 and 73-106 are rejected as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based.

### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariceli Santiago whose telephone number is (571) 272-2464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Application/Control Number: 09/384,326 Page 4

Art Unit: 2879

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Wike ราคใจป Mariceli Santiago Patent Examiner Art Unit 2879

NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800